



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/804,268	03/13/2001	Makoto Muraishi	826.1697/JDH	9108

21171 7590 03/23/2004

STAAS & HALSEY LLP  
SUITE 700  
1201 NEW YORK AVENUE, N.W.  
WASHINGTON, DC 20005

EXAMINER

CHUONG, TRUC T

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2174

DATE MAILED: 03/23/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

# Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/804,268

Applicant(s)

MURAISHI ET AL.

Examiner

Truc T Chuong

Art Unit

2174

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

## Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

## Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 29 December 2003.
- 2a) ☒ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☐ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

## Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

## Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.  
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).  
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

## Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

## Attachment(s)

- |  |   |
|--|---|
| 1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)   | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)                                   | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)             |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)<br>Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____  |

### DETAILED ACTION

1. This communication is responsive to Amendment A, filed 12/29/03.
2. Claims 1-14 are pending in this application. Claims 1, and 10-14 are independent claims. This action is made final.
3. The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior office action.

#### *Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102*

4. Claims 1-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wimble et al. (U.S. Patent No. 5,778,230).

As to claims 1 and 14, Wimble teaches a test support apparatus for supporting a test of a screen program using a graphic user interface, comprising:

a test support class generation unit obtaining screen definition information about a test target screen program (Goal Directed Debugger sets up a different hypothesis to test a program, col. 7 line 9-col. 8 line 33), and generating a test support class which is a subclass inheriting a class of the test target screen program according to the screen definition information (testing a class type of an object, col. 8 lines 1-25, and lower levels, col. 8 lines 26-34), and a class for testing the test target screen program (hypothesis, col. 7 line 9-col. 8 line 33); and

a test execution unit conducting a test of the test target screen program using the generated test support class (The system performs goals and subgoals, and reports the findings of the goals and subgoals to the user, col. 7 lines 20-65).

Art Unit: 2174

As to claim 2, Wimble teaches the apparatus according to claim 1, further comprising a test specification generation unit generating a test specification for the test target screen program according to the screen definition information, and providing the test specification for said test execution unit (the Goal Directed Debugger 2100 is used to generate a list of instructions called subgoals for testing against a written program, col. 7 line 55-col. 8 line 25).

As to claim 3, Wimble teaches the apparatus according to claim 2, further comprising:  
a test report generation unit generating a test report using the test specification generated by said test specification generation unit and a test execution result obtained by said test execution unit (report the user the results, col. 8 lines 24-25).

As to claim 4, Wimble teaches the apparatus according to claim 3, wherein said test support class has a function of supporting input: of input test data (col. 7 lines 15-55).

As to claim 5, Wimble teaches the apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said test support class has a function of recording a test result obtained when a test is conducted (col. 7 lines 20-65).

As to claim 6, Wimble teaches the apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said test support class has a function of visually indicating a test execution portion on a screen (Set a breakpoint, col. 9 lines 37-43).

As to claim 7, Wimble teaches the apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said test support class has a function of conducting a test using new input test data or input data about a previous test execution result (4.1 ImplementGoal, col. 12 lines 9-38).

As to claim 8, Wimble teaches the apparatus according to claim 7, wherein said test support class has a function of displaying a warning when an execution result of a test conducted

Art Unit: 2174

using the input data about the previous test execution result is different from the previous test execution result (set up a different hypothesis, col. 8 lines 10-11).

As to claim 9, Wimble teaches the apparatus according to claim 1, wherein said test support class has a function of supporting measurement of performance of the test target screen program (reporting of physical low level events, col. 11 lines 19-29).

As to claim 10, this is a method claim of the apparatus claim 1. Note the rejection of claim 1 above.

As to claim 11, this is a computer program product claim of the apparatus claim 1. Note the rejections of claim 1 above.

As to claim 12, this is a computer program product claim of the apparatus claims 1 and 4. Note the rejections of claims 1 and 4 above.

As to claim 13, this is a system claim of the apparatus claims 1 and 4. Note the rejections of claims 1 and 4 above.

### ***Response to Arguments***

5. Applicant's arguments filed 12/29/03 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.

Applicants argued the following:

- a. Wimble's debugging system is not an object oriented programming.
- b. Wimble does not teach the object oriented programming level showing subclass and class inheritance.

Art Unit: 2174

- c. Wimble does not address a generation unit to generate a test specification for the test target, class, subclass, definitions, etc.

The Examiner disagrees for the following reasons:

Per (a), Claim language does not clearly state that the system is for an object oriented programming; however, Wimble also discussed the object oriented programming by showing objects having characteristics of extensibility, encapsulation, polymorphism, abstraction, persistency, etc (col. 5 lines 59-62).

Per (b), Wimble clearly teaches subclass and class inheritance by breaking a problem into lower levels of problem solving services (col. 8 lines 26-34).

Per (c), Wimble clearly teaches a Goal Directed Debugger 2100 sets up a different hypothesis to test a program (col. 7 line 9-col. 8 line 33), to test a class type of an object (col. 8 lines 1-25), and the Goal Directed Debugger 2100 is used to generate a list of instructions called subgoals for testing against a written program (col. 7 line 55-col. 8 line 34).

### *Conclusion*

6. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period

Art Unit: 2174

will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

7. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Truc T Chuong whose telephone number is 703-305-5753. The examiner can normally be reached on M-Th and alternate Fridays 8:30 AM - 5:00 PM.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kristine L. Kincaid can be reached on 703-308-0640. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Truc T. Chuong

03/09/04

*Kristine Kincaid*  
KRISTINE KINCAID  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100